



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/822,139	04/12/2004	Marcel Francois Heertjes	081468-0309161	1174
909	7590	07/31/2006	EXAMINER	
PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN, LLP			WOOD, KIMBERLY T	
P.O. BOX 10500			ART UNIT	
MCLEAN, VA 22102			PAPER NUMBER	
			3632	

DATE MAILED: 07/31/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/822,139

Applicant(s)

HEERTJES ET AL.

Examiner

Kimberly T. Wood

Art Unit

3632

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 April 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 6-20 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12 April 2004 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

This is an office action for serial number 10/822,139.

Information Disclosure Statement

The listing of references (Subrahmanyam et al. Active vibration isolation design for a photolithographic stepper) in the specification is not a proper information disclosure statement. 37 CFR 1.98(b) requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office, and MPEP § 609.04(a) states, "the list may not be incorporated into the specification but must be submitted in a separate paper." Therefore, unless the references have been cited by the examiner on form PTO-892, they have not been considered.

Election/Restrictions

Claims 6-20 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected inventions, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in the reply filed on April 24, 2006.

Applicant's election with traverse of Invention I drawn to claims 1-5 in the reply filed on April 24, 2006 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that the restriction is not proper. This is not found persuasive because each invention has

Art Unit: 3632

separate utility without the use of the combination and the method claims are separate and distinct species/inventions requiring different searches and/or classification. Claims 1-5 directed to the vibrations isolation system do not require the particulars of the combination to be a stand alone invention such as a vibration isolation system for any body other than a lithographic apparatus as specifically claimed within claims 6-10. The vibration isolation system of claim 1-5 can be used with a vehicle, a computer, a braking system, or any other device which would use a vibration isolation system. Claims 6-9, 11-15, and 16-20 are directed solely toward a lithographic apparatus, device manufacturing method, or vibration isolation method in combination with a plurality of active isolator devices and a control system however these claims make no mention that the active isolator devices are mechanically coupled to the lithographic apparatus or any body of the illumination system therefore each and every element as claimed by the vibration isolation system of claim 1-6 (mechanically coupled to the body) have not been included within the combination of claims 6-9 therefore the restriction is deemed proper.

The traversal is based on the grounds that the embodiments are directed to a unitary concept and based on various policy

Art Unit: 3632

arguments. These arguments are unpersuasive. The arguments set forth by the applicant (i.e., a want of a serious burden on the examiner, or inventions having the same classification) are arguments commonly set forth when traversing a restriction of the *invention*. (See MPEP 803). However, the examiner is requiring the applicant to elect between several disclosed species. A proper traversal of an election of species includes arguments that the species are not patentable over one another. What's more, if patentably different species are disclosed in the application, "... it is not necessary to show a separate status in the art or separate classification." (See MPEP 808.01(a)). While there is a policy of compact prosecution, the plain language of the rules set forth that an examiner may require an election of species between patentably different species (see MPEP 808.01(a); 37 CFR 1.146). The argument regarding excessive expense is unpersuasive since excessive is a relative concept. Furthermore, as the applicant is aware, a separate fee schedule has been provided for those claiming small-entity status. Finally, there is no policy to reduce the number of patents; in fact, an argument could be made that it is less confusing to have a separate patent for each distinct embodiment.

Art Unit: 3632

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Drawings

Figure 2 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). Corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Art Unit: 3632

Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Figure 2 of the applicant's drawings and Subrahmanyam et al. (as described as prior art within the specification for figure 2 on page 10 [0045]). Figure 2 discloses a plurality of isolator device (ID), a control system (specification page 10, paragraph [0047]), a body (PL and RH, and BF).

Claims 1-5 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Takeo JP6117487. Takeo discloses a plurality of isolators, control system (34, and magnetic control device), body (M), air mounts (10), sensors (41),

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The prior art discloses conventional vibration isolation systems.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kimberly T. Wood whose telephone number is 571-272-6826. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 7:30am to 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Olszewski can be reached on 571-272-6788. The fax phone number for the

Art Unit: 3632

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


Kimberly T. Wood
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3632

July 24, 2006